

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on July 2, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-7 have been amended for non-statutory reasons, such as for better form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A' and deleting reference designations typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Claims 1-7 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicant respectfully reserves all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner suggested adding headings to the specification. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's suggestion, however respectfully decline to add the headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a), and could be inappropriately used in interpreting the

specification.

In the Office Action, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Without agreeing with the Examiner, and in the interest of advancing prosecution, claim 7 has been amended to remove the alleged informality noted by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 7 has been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 8 is objected to for multiple dependency. In response, claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice thus rendering moot this objection. Applicant furthermore reserves the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0113556 (Tao). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 and 9-15 are patentable over Tao for at least the following reasons.

Tao is directed to an electronic ballast for a discharge lamp

which provides dimming. As clearly shown in FIGs 6A-7, any alleged transformer or current sensor designated as N_{s1} or N_{s2} have a terminal connected to a gate or control terminal of a transistor.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 7 and 4 and 6, amongst other patentable elements requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

the current-determining circuit is not connected to the control terminal or the further control terminal.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 4 and 6 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3, 5, 7 and 9-15 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1, 4 and 6 as well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position,

should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
September 25, 2007

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101